

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

JORGE DELFIN,

Petitioner,

v.

COREY FHUERE,

Respondent.

SIMON, District Judge.

Case No. 6:24-cv-00706-SI

ORDER

Petitioner's Motion to Consider Consent (#72) and Motion on Jurisdiction of Magistrate (#86) are denied insofar as all parties must consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction, and all parties have not so consented.

Petitioner's Motion for Summary Judgment (#74) is denied on the basis that it is not contemplated by the Court's Scheduling Order (#6).

Petitioner's Motion to Disqualify Counsel for the Department of Justice (#75) is denied as frivolous.

Petitioner's Motion to Determine Case (#76) is denied as unnecessary. The Court will consider the claims he raises in his Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (#1) and the arguments he makes in his Supporting Memorandum (#82) as contemplated by the Scheduling Order (#6).

Petitioner's Motions for Recusal (#77 & #87) are denied for the reasons given in prior Orders (#20, #55, #84).

Petitioner's Motion for Leave to File an Amicus Brief (#78) is denied because parties to a case do not file amicus briefs.

Petitioner's Motion for Leave to File Brief (#80) is denied because he seeks to file a brief in support of a summary judgment motion that has already been denied.

Petitioner's Motion to Strike Response to Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (#81) is denied on the basis that the Respondent's Response (#29) was properly filed in accordance with the Scheduling Order (#6).

Petitioner's Motion for a Rule 11 Sanction (#85) is denied as unwarranted.

Petitioner's Motion on Jurisdiction of Magistrate (#86) is denied for reasons identified above.

Petitioner's Motion for Relief from Judgment (#88) is denied on the basis that the Court has not entered judgment in this case.

Petitioner's Motion on Request for Certificate of Appealability (#89) is denied as premature. The Court will consider the issue of a certificate of appealability when it rules on the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (#1).

Petitioner's Motion on Summary Judgment (#90) is denied because, as the Court has previously ruled, summary judgment is not appropriate in this case given the Scheduling Order (#6). Petitioner has also not shown a sufficient basis for summary judgment in this case.

Petitioner's Motion for Federal Witness Protection Security (#91) is denied.

///

CONCLUSION

Petitioner's Motions (#72, #74, #75, #76, #77, #78, #80, #81, #85, #86, #87, #88, #89, #90, & #91) are denied. Briefing is now CLOSED for this case and the Court will not accept any further motions for filing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

January 6, 2025

DATE



Michael H. Simon
United States District Judge